

Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)
Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)
Meghan E. George (SBN 274525)
Tom E. Wheeler (SBN 308789)
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.
21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Phone: 877-206-4741
Fax: 866-633-0228
tfriedman@ toddflaw.com
abacon@ toddflaw.com
mgeorge@toddflaw.com
twheeler@toddflaw.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KRISTYNA SOUDERS, individually) Case No.
and on behalf of all others similarly)
situated,) **CLASS**

Plaintiff,) **COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS**
) **OF:**

VS.

SUITED CONNECTOR, LLC; and)
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and each)
of them,)

Defendant.

1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)]
2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff KRISTYNA SOUDERS (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon personal knowledge:

1 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

2 1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others
3 similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable
4 remedies resulting from the illegal actions of SUITED CONNECTOR, LLC d/b/a
5 MORTGAGE.INFO (“Defendant”), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully
6 contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone
7 Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* (“TCPA”) and related
8 regulations, thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy and causing her to incur
9 unnecessary and unwanted expenses.

10 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

11 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff,
12 a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at
13 least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, an
14 Arizona company. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each call in
15 violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in the
16 thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction.
17 Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class
18 Action Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”) are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.

19 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central
20 District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because Defendant does
21 business within the State of California and Plaintiff resides within the County of
22 Los Angeles.

23 **PARTIES**

24 4. Plaintiff, KRISTYNA SOUDERS (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person
25 residing in Palmdale, California and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153
26 (39).

27 5. Defendant, SUITED CONNECTOR, LLC d/b/a MORTGAGE.INFO
28 (“Defendant”), is a mortgage lender matching company, and is a “person” as

1 defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

2 6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are
3 collectively referred to as “Defendants.” The true names and capacities of the
4 Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are
5 currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious
6 names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible
7 for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the
8 Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when
9 such identities become known.

10 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and
11 every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other
12 Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or
13 employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants.
14 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the acts and/or omissions complained
15 of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

16 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 8. Beginning in or around February of 2018, Defendant contacted
18 Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number ending in -4086, in an attempt to
19 solicit Plaintiff to purchase and use Defendant’s services.

20 9. Defendant used an “automatic telephone dialing system” as defined
21 by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its call to Plaintiff seeking to solicit its services.

22 10. Defendant contacted or attempted to contact Plaintiff from telephone
23 numbers confirmed to belong to Defendant, including without limitation (855) 202-
24 1264, (888) 449-9664.

25 11. Defendant’s calls constituted calls that were not for emergency
26 purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

27 12. Defendant’s calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a
28 cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls

1 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

2 13. During all relevant times, Defendant did not possess Plaintiff's "prior
3 express consent" to receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an
4 artificial or prerecorded voice on her cellular telephone pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §
5 227(b)(1)(A).

6 14. Defendant placed multiple calls soliciting its business to Plaintiff on
7 her cellular telephone ending in -4086 beginning in or around February of 2018
8 and continued through March of 2018.

9 15. Such calls constitute solicitation calls pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §
10 64.1200(c)(2) as they were attempts to promote or sell Defendant's services.

11 16. Plaintiff received numerous solicitation calls from Defendant within a
12 12-month period.

13 17. Upon information and belief, and based on Plaintiff's experiences of
14 being called by Defendant despite having no prior relation to Plaintiff whatsoever,
15 and at all relevant times, Defendant failed to establish and implement reasonable
16 practices and procedures to effectively prevent telephone solicitations in violation
17 of the regulations prescribed under 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

18 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

19 18. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others
20 similarly situated, as a member of the proposed class (hereinafter, "The Class"),
21 defined as follows:

22
23 All persons within the United States who received any
24 solicitation/telemarketing telephone calls from
25 Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made
26 through the use of any automatic telephone dialing
27 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such
28 person had not previously consented to receiving such
calls within the four years prior to the filing of this
Complaint

1 19. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of all
2 persons within the United States who received any solicitation/telemarketing
3 telephone calls from Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made through
4 the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded
5 voice and such person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone
6 number to Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

7 20. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class.
8 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the
9 Class's members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should
10 be certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

11 21. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its
12 members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class
13 members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through
14 appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
15 The Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Class
16 members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

17 22. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of
18 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff
19 and The Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and
20 The Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which
21 Plaintiff and The Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or
22 administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the
23 privacy of said Plaintiff and The Class members.

24 23. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The
25 Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of
26 The Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between
27 Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual
28 circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant made any telemarketing/solicitation call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic telephone dialing system or any artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service;
- b. Whether Plaintiff and The Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

24. As a person that received numerous telemarketing/solicitation calls from Defendant using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The Class.

25. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions.

26. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class's member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court

1 system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

2 27. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members
3 would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical
4 matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such
5 adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-
6 party Class members to protect their interests.

7 28. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable
8 to The Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to
9 the members of the Classes as a whole.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

12 **47 U.S.C. §227(b).**

13 **On Behalf of The Class**

14 29. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action
15 the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-28.

16 30. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
17 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each
18 and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b), and in particular
19 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

20 31. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b),
21 Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory
22 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

23 32. Plaintiff and The Class members are also entitled to and seek
24 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection
27 Act**

28 **47 U.S.C. §227(b)**

On Behalf of The Class

33. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action
the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-28.

34. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*, and in particular *47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)*.

35. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*, Plaintiff and The Class members are entitled an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B)* and *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C)*.

36. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227(b)

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)*, Plaintiff and The Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B)*.
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227(b)

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)*, Plaintiff and The Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B)* and *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C)*.
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

37. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Respectfully Submitted this 25th Day of September, 2018.

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s/ Todd M. Friedman

Todd M. Friedman

Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman

Attorney for Plaintiff